

Appl. No.: 09/809,213  
Amdt. dated October 29, 2003  
Reply to Office action of August 26, 2003

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant received the Office Action dated August 26, 2003, in which the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-20 as anticipated by Morishima, as well as rejected newly submitted claims 21-28 also as anticipated by Morishima. Applicant believes that the Examiner may not have fully understood Applicant's previous argument and thus wishes to clarify that argument herein. In general, Applicant stands behind his previous argument and believes all pending claims to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 requires generating display signals for the right and left eye displays using different portions of an image. That is, the portion of the image that is used to generate the right display signal is different from the portion of the image that is used to generate the left display signal. Morishima, by contrast, discloses left and right eye displays that are presented with the same image. For at least this reason claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable.

Applicant wishes to re-emphasize this point, not only because this distinction makes claim 1 patentable, but also in response to the Examiner's "Response to [Applicant's] Arguments" from pages 4-5 of the Office Action. The Examiner stated that:

Applicant's arguments filed 08/04/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that the prior art does not shown an image not having two portion of an image as a first and a second image data, Examiner would like to point that in Figure 3 reference shows only the first half (left side) of the eye portion but in fact it does have a right side of the view which is shown (in Fig. 28b) in a full enlargement view.

The Examiner's point seems to be that Applicant argued that Morishima only discloses a single eye display. Applicant indeed understands that Morishima's system includes a pair of displays—one for each eye. Applicant's argument, however, is that the image presented to Morishima's displays is the same for both displays, whereas in claim 1 the images are different.


The remaining independent claims are patentable for much the same reason as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant does not repeat the arguments

Appl. No.: 09/809,213  
Amdt. dated October 29, 2003  
Reply to Office action of August 26, 2003

presented in his previously submitted Response and, instead, incorporates those arguments by reference herein.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jonathan M. Harris  
PTO Reg. No. 44,144  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 29 2003

OFFICIAL